



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,401	12/08/2000	James Murray	003242.P014	1880

7590 11/03/2003

Mark L. Watson
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

SCHNEIDER, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

10

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,401

Applicant(s)

MURRAY ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Schneider

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,12-16 and 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,12-16, 21-22,24-27and29-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 23 and 28 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly amended and submitted claims 23 and 28 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: In accordance with the restriction in the office action mailed 4/3/2003, the invention of Group II relating to the use of a descriptor mode was found to have separate utility and a divergent search

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the previously presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 23 and 28 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Kamiya reference is used to teach the termination and re-execution of a DMA transfer. The applicant has amended the rejected claims to change the system from being adaptable to perform these functions, to now read that the termination and re-execution of the transfer occur when signaled to do so by the I/O device. While the applicant argues that Kamiya does not teach such a signal such signal are certainly inherent to the processing of the operations. With regards to claim 1, the receiving of signals to start the processing of a high priority request constitute signals to this controller to terminate the current transfer operation. Likewise, with regards to claims 12, 13, and 15, the signals to the controller marking the end of the high priority transfer operation constitute signals to restart the operation being saved in the backup channels of

Art Unit: 2182

this controller. While the applicant may have envisioned different control signals, Kamiya teaches such signals.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. With regards to claim 27, it is taught in the specification how a channel compromises control logic, such that a channel controls the transfer of data.

5. All further rejections and objections are made in light of the specification as best understood in light of the previous objections and rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24-27, 29-32
7. Claims 1, 2, 6, 12-16, 21 and ~~24-32~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,809,335 to Kamiya in further view of the applicant admitted prior art (AAPA). With regards to claim 1, Kamiya teaches a direct memory access (DMA)

Art Unit: 2182

controller (Fig. 2, element 13, of Fig. 1, element 1, and column 3, lines 45-54), external modules (Fig. 1, elements 4, 6, and 8), and the termination of a DMA transfer before a terminal count is reached (column 8, lines 30-41). The reception of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to terminate the current transfer and start the high priority transfer. Kamiya does not explicitly teach the external modules being I/O devices, but this is taught to be well known by the AAPA (page 2, lines 13-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the termination of Kamiya with the I/O devices of the AAPA to create a system that is compatible with known device types and competitive in a modern computer marketplace.

8. With regards to claim 2, Kamiya teaches the re-execution of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 47-50) with an I/O device (external module). The signaling of the end of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to re-execute the terminated transfer.

9. With regards to claim 6, Kamiya teaches a system interconnect (Fig. 1, element 1), coupled to the I/O device (external modules, Fig. 1, elements 6 and 8) and a DMA controller (Fig. 2, element 13, of Fig. 1, element 1), a CPU coupled to the system interconnect (Fig. 1 elements 3 and 1), and a external modules coupled to the system interconnect (Fig. 1, elements 4, 6, and 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the one of the external modules would have to be a memory device in order for the DMA transfer to be a memory access, as defined.

10. With regards to claim 12, Kamiya teaches a direct memory access (DMA) controller (Fig. 2, element 13, of Fig. 1, element 1, and column 3, lines 45-54), external modules (Fig. 1, elements 4, 6, and 8), and the termination of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 30-41). Kamiya

Art Unit: 2182

does not explicitly teach the external modules being I/O devices, though this is taught to be well known by the AAPA (page 2, lines 13-18). Kamiya teaches the re-execution of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 47-50) with an I/O device (external module).

11. With regards to claims 13 and 15, Kamiya teaches a direct memory access (DMA) controller to transfer data between and first and second device (Fig. 2, element 13, of Fig. 1, element 1, and column 3, lines 45-54), external modules (Fig. 1, elements 4, 6, and 8), and the termination of a DMA transfer before a terminal count is reached (column 8, lines 30-41). The reception of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to terminate the current transfer and start the high priority transfer. Kamiya does not explicitly teach the external modules being I/O devices, though this is taught to be well known by the AAPA (page 2, lines 13-18). Kamiya teaches the termination of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 30-41) with an I/O device (external module). Kamiya teaches the re-execution of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 47-50) with an I/O device (external module). The signaling of the end of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to re-execute the terminated transfer. The use of acknowledge signals is not explicitly taught by Kamiya. However, the AAPA teaches that it is well known to use acknowledge signals to acknowledge control signal from an I/O device (page 2, lines 13-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use the well known request and acknowledge control signal lines of the AAPA with the termination and re-execution of Kamiya to create a system which can terminate and re-start DMA transfers, in order to provide a more robust I/O system which can handle CPU interrupts without causing fatal errors in a transfer currently being processed, and will provide greater system stability.

12. With regards to claim 14, Kamiya teaches the reloading the configuration registers with control information (column 8, lines 43-46). It is inherent that this reloading would take place before the transmission of an acknowledge signal which would occur during the following restarting process.

13. With regards to claim 16, Kamiya teaches the reloading the configuration registers with control information (column 8, lines 43-46). It is inherent that this reloading would include the clearing of a well known transfer size counter within the DMA controller that would occur before the following restarting process of the DMA block transfers and the acknowledge signal to the first device to start the transfer.

14. With regards to claim 21, Kamiya teaches the re-execution of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 47-50) with an I/O device (external module). The signaling of the end of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to re-execute the terminated transfer. The use of acknowledge signals is not explicitly taught by Kamiya. However, the AAPA teaches that it is well known to use acknowledge signals to acknowledge control signal from an I/O device (page 2, lines 13-18).

15. With regards to claims 24 and 29, Kamiya teaches a first channel coupled to the I/O device to facilitate the transfer of data (Fig. 2).

16. With regards to claims 25 and 30, Kamiya teaches memory means to store configuration data (Fig. 2). While Kamiya does not call this memory registers, the use of registers in DMA controllers is well known.

17. With regards to claims 26 and 31, error-checking logic is well known in the art for checking data transfers for errors.

Art Unit: 2182

18. With regards to claim 27, Kamiya teaches control logic to control the transfer of the data (Fig. 2, element 13)

19. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,809,335 to Kamiya and the applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) as applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 12-16, 21 and 24-32 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,903,775 to Murray.

20. With regards to claim 22, Kamiya teaches the re-execution of a DMA transfer (column 8, lines 47-50) with an I/O device (external module). The signaling of the end of a high priority request by this controller is a signal to re-execute the terminated transfer. The use of acknowledge signals is not explicitly taught by Kamiya. However, the AAPA teaches that it is well known to use acknowledge signals to acknowledge control signal from an I/O device (page 2, lines 13-18). Kamiya and the AAPA do not explicitly teach the use of a system to terminate a data transfer and to restart the same transfer. Murray teaches an error-checking system that upon the occurrence of an error terminates the transfer through the use of interrupts (column 12, lines 40-56). The interrupt handler retransmits the data that has not been properly transmitted (column 12, line 12, through column 14, line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the termination and re-execution of Kamiya with the error handling of Murray in order to eliminate data loss from transfer errors and increase functionality.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2182

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Schneider whose telephone number is (703) 305-7991. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JDS

Ilwood Park
ILWOOD PARK
AU 2182